SR CORRIDOR STUDY

Meeting Notes

Date: September 19, 2016 3:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Location: FDOT CO-Burns, Executive Conference Room and Conference

Subject: Florida Department of Transportation, Systems Planning Office

SR 60 Corridor Study Technical Team Kick-off (District 5)

On September 19th, 2016, the Technical Team Kick-Off for District 5 was conducted.

Those in attendance were:

Jennifer King FDOT Systems Planning Office – Client Project Manager Chris Edmonston FDOT Systems Planning Office – SIS Planning Manager Thomas Hill FDOT TranStat Office – Systems Traffic Models Manager Jerry Scott FDOT TranStat Office – Freight Data Systems Coordinator

Chris Wiglesworth FDOT Public Transit Office – Transit Planner

Michael Plagens CDM Smith – Project Manager Praveen Pasumarthy CDM Smith – Traffic Engineer

By Phone:

John Zielinski FDOT District 5 – SIS Administrator Jim Ganey FDOT District 5 – Rail Coordinator

Libertad Acosta-Anderson
Jason Learned
Ryan Marks

FDOT District 5 – Transit Intermodal Coordinator
FDOT District 5 – Travel Demand Modeling
FDOT District 5 – Freight Coordinator

Jeremy Dilmore FDOT District 5 – District Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

Manager

Esther Montoya FDOT District 5 – Construction Maintenance

Lori Sellers Hanson Professional Services Adam Ivory CDM Smith – Project Planner

- Introduction and Background: Jennifer King opened the meeting and gave all the attendees the
 opportunity to introduce themselves. Ms. King provided a project background and identified the project
 objectives preemptively identify alternative options, identify operational quick fixes, and identify the
 needs along the study corridor. Ms. King pointed out that this study was initiated based on a white
 paper submitted by FDOT District 1 indicating the need for studying SR 60. Ms. King indicated that the
 white paper will be shared with meeting participants.
- 2. **Presentation**: Ms. King and Mr. Plagens gave the presentation detailing study purpose, study limits, project activities, project goals, agency partners, coordination with other projects/plans, project schedule and project communication. A sample list of studies and plans collected by the project team was also presented. Contact information of the project team managers was provided.



- 3. **Site Visit**: Ms. King described the site visits conducted by the project team and the observations made. Major observations were turnpike intersection with SR 60, US 441 intersection, make shift truck parking at US 441 intersection, red light running at the US 441 intersection by trucks, potentially high crashes near turnpike intersection, signage issue, historic Desert Inn with signage in turning radii, very heavily used travel plaza at the turnpike intersection, and prescribed burning along SR 60. No shoulders, two-lane throughout the District's section of the corridor with minimal passing lane opportunities throughout the District's section of the corridor.
- 4. **Discussion**: The following items/questions were discussed during/after the presentation:
 - a. FDOT D5 indicated that the location along SR 60 near the intersections of turnpike and US 441 is suitable for an ILC. Project team to check with Orange County regarding this.
 - b. Need for a signal at the intersection of SR 60 and turnpike was discussed. FDOT D5 indicated that a signal warrant analysis was previously conducted and that the warrants were not met. D5 will forward the report to the project team. The project team will conduct a warrant analysis as a part of this project. However, it was noted that a signal could potentially create problems (red light running) similar to those faced at the intersection of US 441.
 - c. During the field visit, a couple of observations were made at the intersection of US 441 red light running by trucks and make shift truck parking. FDOT D5 indicated that a study needs to be conducted to review these issues.
 - d. The previous action plan conducted by FDOT D5 along SR 60 was in 1990's.
 - e. During field visits, prescribed burns were observed along SR 60. FDOT D5 indicated that many prescribed burn zones are present in this corridor, but none of them identified as a concern by US Forest Services. The report will be forwarded to the project team.
 - f. FDOT D5 noted that a trail exists in the study corridor to the east of turnpike. The details will be forwarded to the project team.
 - g. Modeling methodology Details of travel demand modeling are being finalized. Statewide model will be used for this study effort, and sub-area validations and other input/calibration information will be provided by FDOT D5.
 - h. During field visits, a fire station sign was observed near the turnpike intersection but a fire station was not observed in the neighborhood. FDOT D5 indicated that a fire station may not be present in the locality and the sign may be removed.
 - i. Ms. King described in detail on the context zone analysis being conducted as a part of this study. Based on FDOT's draft guidance on the implementation of complete streets and the context land use zones, the project team classified the study corridor into the context land use zones using the observations from the site visits. This will provide a snapshot in time of the context for SR 60 study corridor.
 - j. The horizon year for the study is 2045, matching the Needs Plan.
- 5. **Action Items:** The action items from the meeting are:
 - a. Project team will forward any data requests to FDOT D5.
 - b. Project team to forward a copy of the presentation and the white paper prepared by FDOT D1
 - c. FDOT D5 to provide any projects or plans which may be relevant to SR 60 project. FDOT D5 will forward information on a trail near turnpike, report on signal warrant analysis at the intersection of SR 60 and turnpike, and a report by the US Forest Services on the prescribed burning.
 - d. FDOT D5 to respond to additional data requests from the project team.
- 6. **Wrap-up/Adjourn:** Ms. King and Mr. Plagens thanked everyone for their participation.

